



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE INFLUENCE OF COOPER'S *THE SPY* ON HAUFF'S *LICHTENSTEIN*

In recent years there has appeared a number of critical essays showing the influence of various works in English literature upon the writings of Wilhelm Hauff. The German novelist's indebtedness to Walter Scott¹ and Washington Irving² have been satisfactorily demonstrated. Upon investigation it has been found that with the above-mentioned authors there must be included a writer whose influence upon Hauff seems to have hitherto passed unnoticed; namely, the American novelist, James Fenimore Cooper. This paper proposes to show that Cooper's *The Spy* is a source for Hauff's novel *Lichtenstein*.

The Spy was first published in 1821, and two translated editions of it appeared in Germany in 1824, two years before the publication of *Lichtenstein*. It at once became popular in Germany and, as Dr. Barba says,³ "assured Cooper's success on the Continent." The German critics hailed Cooper as the "American Scott." Hauff's admiration for Scott is well known, and it is scarcely probable that he should have remained unacquainted with the works of a man who was being so favorably compared with the great English novelist. As a matter of fact, Hauff really was familiar with Cooper, as statements from his sketch *Die Bücher und die Lesewelt* show. In this sketch the bookseller is made to say, "Ich streite Scott und den beiden Amerikanern (Cooper, Irving) ihr Verdienst nicht ab; sie sind im Gegenteil leider zu gut." Further he adds, in giving an example of how the philistine is wont to criticize an author, "Er (indefinite; author criticized by the philistine) ist doch nicht so schön als Walter Scott und Cooper, und nicht so tief und witzig als Washington Irving. Und welcher Segen für unsere Literatur und den Buchhandel wird

aus diesem Samen (Scott, Cooper, Irving) hervorgehen, den man so reichlich ausstreut?" These quotations have been used as concrete proofs of Hauff's acquaintance with Irving and to some extent also with Scott, so there is no reason why they should not perform the same function in the case of Cooper.

Hauff's chief indebtedness to *The Spy* is for the character of the Piper of Hardt. Most commentators on *Lichtenstein* are somewhat at variance in their explanation of this character; in fact, it has seemed to be one of the few cruxes which the book furnishes. Three papers dealing with Hauff's relations to Scott have been read before the Modern Language Association. In 1900 C. W. Eastman in his paper, in which he maintained that *Ivanhoe* was Hauff's chief Scottian source for *Lichtenstein*, said, "The most original character in *Lichtenstein* is without question the Pfeifer von Hardt, and there seems to be no one person in *Ivanhoe* to whom he seems to exactly correspond."⁴ Three years later (1903), W. H. Carruth showed that *Lichtenstein* bore more resemblances to *Waverley* than to *Ivanhoe*. In regard to the character of the Piper he said, "Hauff's materials are if anything more attractive than those of Scott, and, as they were indigenous, he was forced to treat them in his own manner."⁵ The most comprehensive of these papers was that read by G. W. Thompson in 1911. In it is found the following concerning the Piper: "On the other hand, the Pfeifer von Hardt is a strange composite of Scottian functions. In him we find a guide, spy, messenger, soldier, friend, musician, and general utility man for the hero-heroine-prince interest."⁶ A German critic, Max Drescher, in dealing with Hauff's sources⁷ considers the character of the Piper as purely the invention of the author and states, "Alle drei Elemente nun, sowohl das der Treue gegen den Herrn als das plötzliche Auftreten

¹ Cf. G. W. Thompson, *Wilhelm Hauff's Specific Relation to Walter Scott*, *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assn.* XXVI (1911), 549-91.

² Cf. Otto Plath, *Washington Irving's Einfluss auf Wilhelm Hauff*, *Euphorion* XX, 459-71.

³ P. A. Barba, *Cooper in Germany*, *Indiana University Studies*, No. 21.

⁴ *Americana Germanica* III (1900), 388. See also *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assn.* XV (1900), Append., p. lxxv.

⁵ *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assn.* XVIII (1903), 525.

⁶ *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assn.* XXVI (1911), 570.

⁷ *Die Quellen zu Hauffs Lichtenstein*, Leipzig, 1905, p. 145.

und das Geheimnisvolle, das erst am Schlusse seine Aufklärung findet, hat Hauff in seinem Pfeifer von Hardt vereinigt und ihm damit jene Eigenart und Wirkung verliehen, die ihn zu einer der interessantesten Gestalten unseres Romans machen."

In addition to the fact that a few of the critics seem to consider the Piper to be a character original with Hauff, the majority of them agree on one point at least, that he is a complex character, whatever be his source. Several men have tried to show that the character of the Piper is a kind of synthesis of elements taken from a considerable number of Scottian characters. There does not appear to be any single character in Scott's works which is endowed with more than a very few of the distinctive traits belonging to the Piper. There is one Cooperian character, however, which in composition and function is nearly identical with the Piper. That character is Harvey Birch, the hero of *The Spy*.

Considering the Piper and Birch in detail, we find in the first place that both authors, Cooper and Hauff, have endowed their respective characters with almost the same physical characteristics. Both Birch and the Piper possess extraordinary bodily strength, and remarkable endurance and dexterity, qualities which the ordinary observer would scarcely attribute to the men from their appearance. Their eyes are of the same cold gray color and are especially commented upon in both cases. The remarkable control which both of these men have over themselves is emphasized repeatedly. They are able to change their manner and bearing at will. An excellent example of this power in the Piper is the difference in his bearing on the first and second days in Ulm (*Lichtenstein*, Pt. I; Chs. VIII, IX).⁸ Hauff says of him in this connection, "Welche Gewalt musste dieser Mensch über sich haben! Es war derselbe, und doch schien er ein ganz anderer." Several instances of the same ability on the part of Birch are to be found in Bk. I, Ch. III, of *The Spy*.⁹

⁸ References to *Lichtenstein* are to the Kürschner Edition of Hauff's Works, Vol. I.

⁹ References to *The Spy* are to the 2nd Edition, 2 vols., New York, 1822.

There we have him characterized by such remarks as "his whole system seemed altered;" and "the whole manner of Birch was altered." This extraordinary power of self-control is also shown in another manner, in the cleverness, namely, with which both men wear disguises and actually seem to assume the character of the people they are feigning to be. In one instance Birch disguises himself as a sutler-woman and in another as a country parson, and in both cases he plays his part so skillfully that he is able to deceive the shrewd American soldiers. In a like manner the Piper disguises himself as a peddler to gain information in Tübingen.

The narrative of the trip through the mountains on which the Piper acts as guide to Georg Sturmfeder contains many striking parallels to the account of a similar trip in *The Spy*¹⁰ on which Birch acts as guide for Capt. Wharton. The chief points of similarity in the stories of these trips are noted as follows:

1. The unusual familiarity of both the Piper and Birch with the mountains is commented upon. These two guides know every path and by-way, and the situation of all the farms, villages, etc.

2. Both parties stop beside a brook to enjoy a lunch which the guide has brought along in a "wallet." Compare the following parallel passages:

"Am Rande eines schattigen Buchenwäldchens, wo eine klare Quelle und frische Rosen zur Ruhe einlud, machten sie halt. Georg stieg ab, und sein Führer zog aus seinem Sack ein gutes Mittagsmahl."¹¹

"After reaching the summit of a hill, Harvey seated himself by the side of a little run and opening the wallet that he had slung where his pack was commonly suspended, he invited his comrade to partake of the coarse fare that it contained."¹²

3. Both guides make a sudden deviation in their course and lead away at almost right angles from the path they have been following in order to avoid parties of the enemy.

4. Troups of the enemy's horsemen pass close by.

¹⁰ Bk. II, Ch. XVI.

¹¹ *Lichtenstein*, p. 104.

¹² *The Spy*, II, 240.

5. In certain vicinities the guides take unusual precautions to escape falling into the hands of the enemy.

6. The descent from the hills to the lowlands is particularly mentioned in both accounts.

The similarity of the relations between the Piper and Duke Ulrich of Württemberg and those between Birch and Washington is also worthy of consideration. In *Lichtenstein* the Duke does not enter into the action until late in the story and then for a time he remains incognito. For a period of some weeks his chief place of shelter is a cave where the Piper is his only attendant and chief informer. The remarkable devotion of the Piper to the Duke is repeatedly shown. In *The Spy* we catch a glimpse of Washington, incognito, in the first chapter of the book and then he does not enter into the story again until near the end. Even then he remains incognito and it is only in the next to last chapter (Bk. II, Ch. XVIII) that his identity is revealed. He frequently meets Birch, the spy, in a lonely rendezvous which is half cave, half hut. Birch is his chief informer as to the movements of the enemy. The splendid loyalty of Birch to his country and his devotion to Washington are shown in the scene of the last meeting of the two men (Bk. II, Ch. XVIII).

In addition to the similarities in the characters of the Piper and Harvey Birch mentioned above, the following close resemblances should also be noted:

1. Both characters belong to relatively the same class of society. Birch cannot be called a peasant, for no such class has ever been recognized in America, but he belonged to the class which most nearly corresponded to that which in Europe was designated by the term *peasant*.

2. The Piper, like Birch, is known among the enemy as a spy. The enemy are continually trying to capture him and his life is constantly in jeopardy, as is the case with Birch.

3. The fact that both these men are away from home for weeks and months at a time is commented upon by those whom they have left behind them at home.¹³

¹³ Cf. especially *Lichtenstein*, p. 127; and *The Spy*, I, 149.

4. Birch brings a warning to Capt. Wharton which is unheeded until it is too late to avoid capture (*The Spy*, Bk. I, Ch. IV). The same is true of the warning which the Piper brings to Georg (*Lichtenstein*, Pt. I, Chs. VIII, IX).

5. Both men aid considerably in furthering the development of the principal love interest. Birch's part in the love affair of Major Dunwoodie and Frances Wharton may not seem very evident, but upon close observation it will be found to be fully equal to the Piper's part in the love affair of Georg and Marie.

6. Both men die fighting for the cause which they have loved and long served so well.

In his statement quoted above, Dr. Thompson describes the Piper of Hardt as a "composite of Scottian functions" which he designates as "guide, spy, messenger, soldier, friend, musician, and general utility man for the hero-heroine-prince interest." It will be found to be true that the character of Harvey Birch performs all these functions with the exception of one. We do not find mention of Birch possessing any musical talent; but it must be remembered that the Piper's profession of musician serves the same purpose as Birch's peddling, namely, to conceal his actions as spy and informer for the cause which he served.

There are other interesting analogies in the plot, structure, and content of the two works under consideration, but as in most cases parallel analogies with one or more of Scott's novels are also found, one is more prone to give credit for these similarities to Scottian sources. Yet it is not possible to deny absolutely that Cooper also had some share in influencing Hauff in these respects. For the sake of illustration, a few of the analogies (between *The Spy* and *Lichtenstein*) referred to above are here given:

1. A strong friendship between men fighting on opposite sides—Sturmfeder and Frondsberg in *Lichtenstein*; Capt. Wharton and Major Dunwoodie in *The Spy*.

2. The two chief female characters are in love with men of opposite parties.

3. The hero of *Lichtenstein* and the character most nearly corresponding to him in *The Spy*, Major Dunwoodie, both save and befriend persons of the other side.

4. The two principal female characters are closely related.

5. The parties in the principal love affair are engaged before the commencement of the action.

6. A mysterious stranger visits the home of the heroine. This stranger proves to be the leader in the political interest and plays an analogous part in the action of both novels.

The facts presented show quite conclusively, it is believed, that Cooper's *The Spy*, as a source for Hauff's *Lichtenstein*, must be reckoned along with the number of other influences which have been shown to have had their effect on this novel. It is not contended that Cooper's influence has been more than a minor one, but, nevertheless, the pointing out of it will, it is hoped, clear up what has hitherto been a matter of some uncertainty and conjecture.

C. D. BRENNER.

Princeton University.

ROSTAND, MAGNE, AND BARO

If a lover of *Cyrano* chances to read *les Erreurs de documentation de Cyrano de Bergerac*,¹ his appreciation of the play will not be lessened by reason of the anachronisms that M. Magne discovers in it. He will, however, be led into error if he believes that the critic's documentation is everywhere superior to the poet's. This fact can be readily established if we read what Magne has to say in regard to Rostand's use of Baro's *Clorise*.

It will be remembered that this is the play in which Montfleury is acting when he is cruelly interrupted by Cyrano, and that Rostand in his stage directions dates the scene 1640. Here lies what Magne considers "l'erreur principale"² of the first act, for, as *la Clorise* first appeared in 1631,³ possessed little merit, and encountered

the rivalry of a number of better plays,⁴ he believes that it could not have been acted later than 1631. He then criticizes Rostand as if he had laid the scene in that year and points out the facts that at that time high society, and especially Richelieu, would not have come to the disreputable Hôtel de Bourgogne, that there could then be no reference to the *Cid*, that L'Epy, Jodelet, and other actors mentioned by Rostand were not then playing at the Hôtel de Bourgogne, that Montfleury was not in Paris, and that Cyrano himself was an eleven-year-old boy at school in the country.⁵

A portion of this criticism, clipped from the *Revue de France* and sent to Rostand, drew from the poet a letter in which with charming irony he pointed out that local color does not depend on historical minutiae, that he was aware of his anachronisms when he wrote the play, and that Magne's objections are of no value, as he refuses to accept 1640, which Rostand believes to be a reasonable date for a revival of *la Clorise*.⁶ Let me quote from Magne's emphatic reply to these wise words: "Vous posez comme des axiomes indiscutables les erreurs qui ont provoqué ma critique. 1640 fait tomber, dites-vous, *une partie de mes observations*.—Mais justement, 1640 est une date fausse et mes observations ne tomberont que devant la preuve d'une reprise de *la Clorise*. Et je doute que vous me la donniez jamais, car on se[ne] songe guère à reprendre la pièce

¹Numerous mistakes occur in this connection on pages 17 and 18, which would be of no importance in *Cyrano*, but which amaze us in one who professes devotion to accuracy. Rotrou did not bring out *Cléagénor et Doristée*, *Diane*, *Occasions perdues*, and *Heureuse Constance* in 1630 and 1631, but three years later; cf. Stiefel, *ZFSL.*, XVI, 1-49. Rotrou's best plays were not written between 1631 and 1640, for *la Sœur*, *Venceslas*, and *Cosroës* appeared after the latter date. "Chauvreau" is a misprint for Chevreau. Gilbert's best plays were not written between 1631 and 1640, for his first piece came out in the latter year (cf. Chapelain, *Lettres*, I, 656, 657) and his others were subsequent to it.

²Pp. 19 seq. Magne appears to be ignorant of the fact that the first representation of the *Cid* was at the Théâtre du Marais.

³This autograph letter is published by Magne in his preface, pp. xviii, xix.

¹By Emile Magne, Paris, 1898.

²P. 15.

³*Ibid.* This date is correct, but Magne makes the further remark that the play was printed in 1632, although the edition which he has had in his hands has the date 1631 in its *achevé d'imprimer*.